UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/393,998	09/08/1999	CRAIG F. CULVER	IMM060.RE	3595
	7590 05/02/200 ARTMENT (51851)	8	EXAMINER BODDIE, WILLIAM	IINER
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1001 WEST FOURTH STREET			BODDIE, WILLIAM	
	LEM, NC 27101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/393,998	CULVER, CRAIG	} F.
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM L. BODDIE	2629	
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Res</u>	sponse to Non-Fi	nal Entered
(1) <u>WILLIAM L. BODDIE</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Carl Sanders</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 29 April 2008	Time: <u>9:45</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicate Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: See Continuation Sheet			
Claims discussed: 91			
Prior art documents discussed: None			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
/William L Boddie/ Examiner, Art Unit 2629	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: Newly claimed 91 contains 112 concerns, as it appears that claim 90 was inadvertantly omitted when all the limitations of claims prior to claim 91 were incorporated into claim 91. Additionally, the declaration of the case is not currently sufficient..

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative agreed that he would submit a supplemental amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 90 into claim 91. Additionally the Applicant's representative would submit a new declaration taking into consideration the requirements set forth in section 1414 of the MPEP..